UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes
Editor in Chief

Louis L. Mann
Curtis W. Reese
Associate Editors

Special Announcement!

Coming This Summer—A Series of Four Articles

AN ORDEAL OF FIRE

PEASANT DISTRESS IN INDIA

(Being a detailed explanation of the immediate and remote causes for the renewal of Civil Disobedience in India by the India National Congress under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi.)

By G. B. HALSTEAD

(For three years a worker in the Educational and Missionary field in India and who was recently asked by the British Government to leave India because of his sympathy with her cause.)

[UNITY is indebted to the All-World Gandhi Fellowship, John Haynes Holmes, President, 105 East 22nd Street, New York, for the use of these articles, which are the most important yet published in this country.]

ALSO

A FEATURE ARTICLE, summarizing the situation in India at the end of six months since Gandhi's arrest, written by

RICHARD B. GREGG

[An American three years' resident in India, six months at Gandhi's Ashram, now editor of the fortnightly Bulletin published by the American League for India's Freedom.]

READ UNITY FOR FULL REPORTS ON INDIA

VOLUME CIX NUMBER 18

Chicago, July 4, 1932

PRICE TEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Weekly October to June — *Subscription $3.00*
Published Bi-Weekly July to September — *Single Copies 10 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, July 30, 1931, at the Post office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor in Chief*
EDITH LLOYD JONES, *Managing Editor*

Associate Editors
LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

Board of Directors
MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON, Treasurer
MRS. ELLA R. NAGELY
MRS. EDITH LLOYD JONES
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Board
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
RAYMOND H. PALMER
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors
LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Editorial Contributors
W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
PERCY M. DAWSON
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
FREDERICK STARR
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
JAMES H. WEST

Foreign Representatives
AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
CANADA—NORMAN STEWART DOWD
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

	Page
EDITORIAL—	
Notes	275
"From Intellect to Intuition"—ZONA GALE	277
ARTICLES—	
Washington on War	275
To Britain—Appeal and Warning—SYDNEY STRONG	278
Security and Armaments—(2) Security Through Disarmament —WILFRED WELLOCK	280
The Significance of the Lindbergh Case—HAROLD P. MARLEY	282
POETRY—	
"Men of Labor, Lift the Cry"—EDWIN MARKHAM	283
"Love Spake Within My Heart"—REGINALD A. REYNOLDS	283
The Survey—ROBERT WHITAKER	283
Bread Line—GEORGIANA BOLE KING	283
THE STUDY TABLE—	
The Story of War Versus Civilization—BRENT DOW ALLINSON	284
CORRESPONDENCE—	
Military Expenditures—LYDIA G. WENTWORTH	286
Manifesto—Women's International League for Peace and Freedom	287
Drinking in America—MARY B. DAIN	287
THE FIELD—	
Women's Manifesto for Disarmament — Foreword — SYDNEY STRONG	274
A Provocative Statement Regarding Causes and Cures of the Depression—JEROME DAVIS and BERTON EUGENE KILE	287
Just Published "Development of the Peace Idea and Other Essays" by Benjamin F. Trueblood	288

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

The Women's Manifesto for Disarmament

Foreword

[By Our Special Correspondent]

No one will wish to miss a word of this story of what may prove to be a great adventure in world peace. I feel certain that God is in it.

The deadlock has come in the Geneva Conference. I have been expecting, in fact praying for it—for until men see that reduction and limitation of armaments involves hypocrisy and irreconcilable conflict, they will not turn to the only effective way, namely, immediate total disarmament.

It is vain to put our faith in men leaders—least of all in men trained in the old devious methods of war diplomacy, such as now head the half dozen delegations in the Conference who determine action. Need I name them? They come at once to mind.

Sweep the decks clear of all the rubbish that has been heaped up by the Commissions and in one day the delegates could declare for total disarmament, and a committee of five from five nations could formulate an effective plan in one week, that would in three months rid the world of all our hellish weapons. The men to whom the work has been given move like paralytics.

The women could bring it to pass, if they set out with a will to do it—determined even to die unless they have their way. Nothing but total disarmament, and at once.

Mrs. Turner's appeal from Berlin* is a sign of daybreak and hope. There should be instantaneous response by mail, radio and cable. Hundreds and thousands should join in from all lands. I am looking for "things to happen" springing out of the invention of woman fighting for her offspring—for that is what it comes down to. The women are going to be thinking of ways and means, of tactics, to put it over. Women like Madame Duchene, with the spirit of Joan of Arc, will march on Paris or Geneva, with demands to secure, and stay until they are heeded. Women like Maude Roydon will organize praying bands around the enlisting boards or on the steps of Westminster. If ten thousand women in ten countries went on a hunger strike—resolved to die, if total disarmament was not granted, it would come to pass. Remember, ten million died in the recent useless massacre. Let women demand that generals and admirals keep out of sight—and forever.

The movement started by Mrs. Turner should be the match that will fire thousands and thousands of women who will use their brains and hearts and arts to compel the governments to bring about total disarmament at once. Then, what a world this would be!

*See UNITY, June 20th, page 246.—EDITOR.

(*Continued on page* 287)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CIX MONDAY, JULY 4, 1932 Number 18

WASHINGTON ON WAR

[A Bi-Centenary Quotation]

"My first wish is to see this plague (war) to mankind banished from off the earth, and the sons and daughters of this world employed in more pleasing and innocent amusements than in preparing implements and exercising them for the destruction of mankind."

—George Washington.

July 4th awakens mingled sentiments these days. As it turns attention back to the great years of the struggle for national independence, the heart is stirred anew to reverence and gratitude. Of course, there were sordid aspects of American life during the Revolution. The brave Continental troops were only a fraction of the population. Not all public leaders were as unselfish as Washington, as wise as Franklin, as idealistic as Jefferson. But there was a real passion for freedom in the thirteen colonies, which dominated the situation by sheer force of sacrifice and unutterable determination. After all the "debunking" of the revolutionary era, this is the fact which remains—that a people's love of liberty began, sustained, and at last achieved, a victorious battle for "a new nation"! That love of liberty long endured—but where is it today? We know of no surer test of this question than that of the attitude of Americans toward the struggle of other peoples for the attainment of such independence as our fathers won on July 4th, 1776. For years the citizens of this country responded with enraptured zeal to the call of any sore-oppressed people anywhere for help in their fight for freedom. Greece, Hungary, Poland, Italy, Ireland, Cuba, the various South American countries, all had the quick sympathy and ardent aid of Americans in their revolutions, successful or unsuccessful, against alien rule. But times have changed—or, rather, Americans have changed! Revolutionary struggles still go on, but the people of this country remain largely indifferent, or openly hostile. India at this moment is the perfect test. Here is a great people, led by a supreme statesman and hero, striving for the same independence which we ourselves won from the British crown a century and a half ago. But we do not respond. The Irish struggle for national liberty is again in crisis. But we feel little sympathy. We even remain content to hold the Filipinos in bondage to our own rule, and year after year resist their demand for emancipation. Are we getting effete and old, that liberty no longer moves us?

All accounts of the Republican National Convention agree that there was no interest in anything but the Prohibition issue. There was a little excitement over the vice-presidential candidacy, but otherwise nothing was considered but liquor. A platform discussing political and economic issues in the most critical days of contemporary life was written without attention and adopted without concern. What mattered it if banks were crashing, business failing, millions starving, the very fabric of the nation's life in jeopardy? Nobody cared, provided only booze was freed from the shackles of the 18th Amendment! This fact would be an utter disgrace, and would damn the Convention to perdition, were it not for the further fact that this attitude was an exact reflection of the attitude of the nation at large. The same phenomenon, for example, will be seen at the Democratic Convention, which will meet before these lines are printed. We take this to mean two things! First, the absorbing and exclusive interest of the American mind in the liquor question shows the frivolity, superficiality, ignorance, and sheer vulgarity of this mind. When, in the midst of times like these, a great national convention, called to lead the people out of their distress and save the state itself from disaster, can go crazy over booze, then something is fundamentally the matter with the nation's life. Degeneracy has obviously set in. This is one aspect of the situation! The other is that, in the absence of all constructive leadership, in the failure of every endeavor to stay the progress of political and economic collapse, in the ever-deepening darkness of catastrophe, the people are trying to get away from reality and save themselves through some mad delusion. The growing mania against Prohibition is nothing in the world so much as an escape-mechanism at work. We are sure that, in days like these, we ought to be seeking some great reform. We dare not face the real reform of making over the economic structure of society. So we arbitrarily create a sham reform out of the "repeal" question. Well—we may be fooling ourselves, but we are not fooling God!

What is to be said about the Prohibition plank in

the Republican platform, which took the long hours of an entire night to write in the committee, and the long hours of another night to debate and pass in the convention? The first and last thing to be said, as Senator Borah so bravely and clearly pointed out, is that the Prohibition pronouncement is dishonest in every one of its tangled, confused, contradictory, and compromising phrases. This statement was composed not to present a principle, but to catch votes. It is a sop to Cerberus—in this case, the two-headed Cerberus of "wets" and "drys" who divide the Republican Party exactly as they divide the Democratic Party. The one desperate endeavor of the resolutions committee at Chicago, at any expense of convictions and ideals, was to produce a declaration which would not alienate the "drys" and would yet satisfy the "wets." The result, as might have been expected in a case where principle was feverishly sacrificed to expediency, is a monstrosity which outrages both "wets" and "drys." Conceived in cowardice and born in deceit, this Prohibition plank will do more than any other one thing to jeopardize Republican success this fall. This leads us to the second thing to be said about this Republican confession of faith, if it may be blasphemously called such, on the liquor question. When the tangle of verbiage is hacked away and the heart of the dictionary jungle laid bare, it is apparent that the G. O. P. is calling for the repeal of the 18th Amendment. Of course, there is nothing said about repeal—on the contrary, there is much mumbo-jumbo language about not going backward, rigorous law enforcement, safeguarding the gains made under Prohibition, and all the rest. But what the Republican plank really calls for is an ending of the national ban on liquor, and a return of the whole issue to the separate states. "The effective part of the plan," says the New York *Times,* "is to give back to the states full control of the liquor traffic. If this is not 'repeal' of the 18th Amendment, what is it?" We have no answer to this question. Whatever the dissatisfaction of the sopping "wets," the "drys" were beaten at Chicago. The cause has received a serious set-back which will not be put any "forreder" when the booze convention of the Democrats comes together.

As the Democratic National Convention will have met and in all probability adjourned before this issue of UNITY can appear, and as we shall therefore have no opportunity to comment upon proceedings until mid-July, it may be as well to state here that we see no prospect of anything being done by the Democrats to win our support or even stir our interest. Barring the rowdy fights that almost invariably accompany any gathering of the Democrats, the Convention will be as near a duplication of the earlier Republican affair as may be humanly possible. The platform will be as confused, cumbersome, and fundamentally dishonest; the candidate as satisfactory to dominant banking and business interests. If this candidate chances to be Franklin D. Roosevelt, as seems likely at the moment of writing, he will be less experienced, less efficient, weaker in character, and far worse in his corrupt political associations, than President Hoover. He will also be far less honest, for the New York Governor, among other things, is an arrant sham. Pretending to be respectable, he works hand and glove with the vilest gang of political pirates that the country has ever known. Posing as a radical—on the power issue, for example—he has neither the knowledge, intelligence, nor courage to lead the nation aright. No—in neither principles nor persons does the Democracy offer us any hope. More obvious every day becomes the absurdity of these two old parties competing against one another. When Heywood Broun and Robert Morss Lovett telegraphed the Republican Convention and urged the delegates to nominate Mr. Roosevelt as vice-president on a ticket with Mr. Hoover as president, and to commend this ticket to the Democrats, they spoke exceeding wisdom. So did Martin D. Littleton, of New York, an old Democratic war-horse, when he suggested that the Republicans and the Democrats pool their two conventions, present a common ticket and common platform, and thus prepare the way for coalition government. In due course, opposition would appear against this coalition, and thereupon we should have a new alignment of parties which would mean something. But nothing like this can be expected. Again it must be the fight between Tweedledee and Tweedledum. Get down your "Alice Through the Looking-Glass," and read about that fight!

After reading day after day the story of the Bonus Army in Washington, we felt like going back to our Gibbon, which we have not opened for years, and reading the old story of the Pretorian Guard. Certainly this attempt by ex-soldiers to brow-beat Congress and the President in their own private and selfish interest looks like nothing quite so much as the work of the old Guard at Rome in making and unmaking emperors. Our American veterans have only to develop consistently along present lines to become a modern Pretorian Guard in very earnest. It is to the credit of the Senate, be it said, and be it remembered, that the Bonus outrage was defeated by so decisive a vote, just as it is to the everlasting discredit of the House that it yielded weakly to outside pressure and passed the bill. But now that the raid upon the national treasury has (for the present at least!) been defeated, it may be well to note that this army of vagabonds in Washington was made up of men who not only were once soldiers but are now very definitely unemployed. These veterans would never have thought of this desperate and disreputable adventure in the

nation's capital, had it not been for the fact that they were without jobs, had been without jobs for a long time, and were now face to face with starvation. This march on Washington, in other words, was the direct result of the government's failure to care for its unemployed in the systematic as well as merciful way in which European governments have long since learned to care for their unemployed. President Hoover appealed in this emergency to "rugged individualism"—and failed, since no unaided individual could stand up against such a flood of disaster as has overwhelmed the nation. Then he instructed local groups—states, counties, cities—to care for their own, and these tried to do so; but of course there came failure again, since the local unit had no resources adequate for so gigantic a task. Among the millions of men and women thus thrown into misery and peril, the ex-soldiers had a rallying-cry, and thus were the first to come together in revolt against the government's indifference and neglect. Now, very belatedly, with wild extravagance, and by a method without forethought or system, the administration is bringing the wealth of the country to the relief of the unemployed. What a tale of botchery and bungling!

Great excitement in New York City over the decision of the Board of Estimate and Apportionment to operate the new Eighth Avenue subway as a municipal enterprise! And the excitement is justified, for this is an extension of the field of public service, conspicuously in the first city of the land, which has the largest significance. Of course, the city didn't want to go into this business of running its own subways, any more than the bankers and big business men and newspapers wanted it to do so. We have a kind of superstition in this country against municipal activities of this sort—a superstition well-grounded on the enormous profits extorted by private corporations, and on the equally enormous graft extorted by politicians! But in this case, the city had no choice. Private bidders, caught by the depression, were helpless to rise to the occasion. And so New York will now be running trains and taking in fares in the newest and finest of all subways on this continent! Some day, of course, when our cities are doing all their own business, people will marvel that there should have been so much excitement over this Eighth Avenue affair. New York City has always *built* its subways—why should it not operate them, and thus get for itself the profits accruing from its huge investment? New York runs its fire department—why should it not also run its street cars and bus lines? New York sells water to its citizens—why should it not likewise sell gas, electricity, coal and milk? New York builds, owns and controls its streets, bridges, parks and playgrounds—why should it not in the same way build, own and control its tenements and homes? New York maintains a great public library, a city museum, schools, and a college—why should it not similarly maintain theatres, an opera-house, and the radio stations? The answer, of course, is—*private profit*. Certain favored individuals are making millions out of the public in doing for the city what the city ought to be doing for itself.

"From Intellect to Intuition"

A new book which holds for us great value is Alice Bailey's book called "From Intellect to Intuition." Since Bergson hinted at intuition as a possible next chamber for consciousness to function in, to a degree as yet undivined, we have had many an introduction to the idea which he had popularized. Now this book gathers up many a precious strand, on which Mrs. Bailey brings to bear her own fine intuition. The book is a book for to-morrow.

From the introduction, which we had the honor to write, we quote the following:

"It is with this mode of spiritual awareness that this book deals—not a new subject, since it forms the basis of the great religions, but new in the clarity of its proposal for a technique of arriving at this awareness. And at more.

"It is qualitative of the times that whereas formerly extensions of consciousness were loosely classifiable as ends of desire—desire for good, desire for God, desire to share in high attributes, to sink into some ecstatic state and to wait passively for the return of that state, now, rather, the classification is under that of voluntary experience, arrived at by a process as definite as that of the attainment of any other knowledge. Education is not inspiration. Education is a process. This further extension of awareness is regarded as education. Indeed the function of education so far may have been but preparation for a new process, as rigorous as the best of the old, for arriving upon a new era of knowing.

"Therefore when Dr. Arthur Compton, Nobel prize winner, says that there is thought which is not cerebral at all, it may be that he means that there is thought whose process is not cerebral as we now know the brain—or is not of the mind as we now know the mind.

"Certainly scientists and others are at variance as to the nature of the mind and of its instrument, the brain. The appendix of this book records some of these variations, as that the mind is a separate entity; the mind is a mechanism, of which brain and nervous system are integral parts; that it is a 'sort of superior non-physical structure—capable of strict scientific study and liable to its own disorders'; that it is pow-

ers of contact and reaction. These too appear to us in their 'framework of time and space'— and of familiarity. There are 'correspondences' of these powers. And these higher correspondences of lower and familiar powers must be co-ordinated with them and human consciousness will then arise, to transcend that dreamlike awareness in which we now move.

"It is this co-ordination which is said to be accomplished by meditation. By meditation we become aware of inner, or at all events other, states of consciousness, we enter upon them, and function there.

" 'The whole object of the science of meditation,' says the author of this book, 'is to enable man to become in outer manifestation that which he is in inner reality, and to make him identify himself with his "inner" aspect and not simply with his outer and lower characteristics.' To identify himself with that 'Deeper Being' of which Keyserling speaks."

Thus it is to be seen that the cry for "moral" living is a primitive cry, the desire-end of those who see a set of results, but are ignorant of their meaning. "Aspiration, that is cheap," a teacher once said. To co-ordinate known with unknown powers, to enter upon potentialities of energy, and actually to unfold new energies—this is the process, with a technique about which already much is known. As accompaniment to these, there is no objection to aspiration. But aspiration is not enough. To observe a technique—the technique of meditation—one as definite, it seems, as are vocal exercises; to organize life, regulate activities, to become re-focussed in an actual manner of living—this is the program.

The technique, as outlined by Mrs. Bailey, the layman will think, may or may not be an ultimate. The steps in this meditation technique we need not debate. Whatever such a process now offers, it is probable that, when a few more horizons have been pushed back by psychology, that process will have been modified, or perhaps affected by substitution. The need may be to recognize that there *is* a new technique of mental unfoldment—that is, of education; and that in that unfoldment this process of meditation is involved.

"This re-orientation of the advanced human being," Mrs. Bailey says, "must find its place in our mass education."

In other words, it may be necessary to bring about the union between the self and its instruments, if man is ever to find any degree of permanent satisfaction in his living.

ZONA GALE.

To Britain—Appeal and Warning

[From our Special Correspondent]

Last night I heard a lecture on Shanghai. It was illustrated with photographs. I saw shell-holes, refugees, thousands of wrecked homes—gruesome evidences of the cruel, cowardly attack on defenseless people—women and children. That happened about the time I saw Yen declare before the Council of the League, "In three hours, the bombing will be begun!" At that moment, I looked at Simon and Bon-cour, of the Council. If they had said with emphasis, "That must not go on," Japan would have paused. But, they were like David, weighted down with heavy armor. They had "special interests."

After the lecture, a friend told me that he had just come from Poland, and learned from reliable sources that Japan had placed there a very heavy order for military supplies.

The Disarmament Conference yesterday (after 14 weeks now) voted to appoint a special committee on chemicals and bacteriology! I mention this not to laugh, but to illustrate the irreconcilable conflict when the problem of disarmament is approached by the principle of *reduction*.

Every day brings me evidence that the problem of disarmament cannot be solved except by total disarmament. This is a *law of peace*. To talk about reduction is not merely a waste of time; it is to engage in incantations, besides letting the divine Day of Opportunity go by.

Ten years ago, I declared, as did others, that reparations and debts ought to be sponged off the slate. I was right, as the Lausanne Conference bears testimony. In the same way, I feel that I am right in saying that total disarmament at once is the only remedy for war, that should come before the Conference. I am confident that ten years will prove my statement to be correct. But, why wait, and do the right thing too late?

I am convinced that Britain is the one nation in the Conference that could lead a hopeful movement for immediate total disarmament. I speak of this as a compliment, and also as involving a great responsibility.

In the first place, Britain has the dominant power of control in the Conference. Perhaps, I should not disclose this, as she may not be conscious of it. She has the chairman of the Conference, Henderson; the head of the powerful Secretariat (in which the Conference breathes and has its being), Drummond; the best organized delegation. The British delegate, half the time, is called upon to speak first. The most controlling resolutions have come from Britain. By far the most powerful peace propaganda at Geneva is British made. In general, it is a unit and is back of what is called the Budapest Program, the child of the International League of Unions and fathered by Robert Cecil. I go nowhere among the "peace lobbyists" (like myself) without finding the British in the large majority. They are intelligent and are in the "know" all the way up to Henderson. It is the same in the committees working for disarmament; the British are sitting on the front seats, or in the "chair." Half of the information that goes out to American papers (particularly religious and pacifist) to be used in influencing legislation and the public mind is suggested by some of the numerous British in Geneva on the job. Henderson on the bridge, Simon at the wheel, Drummond

in the engine-room, and Cecil at the radio, make a significant British quartette in the World's Disarmament Conference.

It is the same in the Council and Assembly of the League—Britain sits next to the throne. In such little matters as the independence of Iraq, or slavery in Liberia, legislation regarding inequalities of sex, or the Free City of Danzig—Britain exercises a dominating influence. In a really big matter like Shanghai and Manchuria, you notice that the "chair" of both the Commissions is occupied by an Englishman. This is noted not in envy, but to point out a fact which locates the responsibility.

This gives me my first reason for affirming that *Britain ought to lead off* at the Conference in a program for immediate general total disarmament. If Simon had presented Litvinoff's plan for total disarmament, instead of dodging back into the "frame work of the Draft Convention," it would have gone through with a bang, and the people of earth would by now be singing the "Hallelujah Chorus." The reason for this is plain. In this matter of disarmament, the law of primogeniture works. The "eldest" must start. You remember the story, when Jesus faced a council of men over stoning an adulterous woman. They could not stand his searching eyes of truth, and went out, according to a divine psychology, "Beginning at the *eldest,* even unto the last." That was a case of total disarmament, and it started at the right place and proceeded logically. . . It is really silly to suggest that Bolivia, Norway, Persia, go through the agony of listing their arms, while Britain (with America, France and Co.) have high grade submarines, airplanes, ships, all made for war, all over the earth, that could smother the little nations in a month. . . At any rate, may the Big Powers save themselves from hypocrisy!

Britain ought to lead off in the Plan of Total Disarmament, for the reason given. She is the "eldest" —is the biggest, most far-flung military power, and what is sinister is not neglecting to "strengthen her bulwarks" everywhere, as the days are passing by. She has no reason for hastening the work of reduction of arms and can really afford to play the game of watchful waiting—since the present status quo, in its military aspects, is not to her unsatisfactory.

Rather significant, there is no plan for reduction that is being proposed—even disarmament down to Germany's level—that would effect her relative superiority, as a military power. She would be left atop of the world. This is, frankly, why I favor total disarmament, and begun by Britain. The world will be left unsafe if Britain does not completely disarm. The destruction of capital-ships will not make Switzerland safer. Frankly, as an American, I favor either complete disarmament for my country—putting it solidly in the Constitution—or possessing the best arms in the world. So, I am forced back to my conviction, that Britain ought to be the one to lead off in a program for Total Disarmament. Politely, I say, "You first, Cousin John. The honors (or honours) are yours!" How much I'd like to be sitting in the Conference, when God had brought about a deadlock (for which many are praying), and in the dispair of confusion born of irreconcilable interests, they would turn to Total Disarmament as the one way to world peace, and hear President Henderson say, "The discussion on the resolution for total disarmament will be opened by Sir John Simon." That speech would, I am certain, be taken down by the recording angel and broadcasted all over the heavens! . . I have my doubts about some of the other speeches emanating from the same fountain.

A second reason for my affirming that Britain *ought to lead off* in a Program for Total Disarmament is her long record as a war-maker. Frankly, with such a record for making war, the nations of the world would be justified in not feeling safe until Britain was disarmed to their level, or until the world were put under protection of a world police force, that would make America and Britain "behave" as fairly as the little nations. The world cannot be made safe from war, until security obtains equally for all nations. Britain must give more than her word, if she is expected to keep the peace, so long as she holds superior weapons in her hands.

I brought to Geneva with me a little book, entitled "Dymond on War." It has an Introduction by John Bright. I know it comes out of the middle of last century, but its 86 pages constitutes it a classic, which would make all statesmen wiser. Bright is willing to describe war as "the sum of all villainies." Dymond states that between the years 1141 and 1815, an interval of 676 years, "our country (England) was at war with France alone 266 years. Adding our wars with other countries, one-half of the last six or seven centuries has been spent by this country in war!" Dymond also produces tables showing the cost in lives and money for the 25 years between 1855-80. It is staggering. The cost of war since 1880 is beyond the imagination of man to conceive!

Personally, I share all this inheritance as much as someone born in London. It, however, remains that Britain because of her war record is the one to lead in total disarmament. Otherwise, she cannot be trusted, as her record is too bad. Many years ago I visited Egypt and Palestine. Gordon was in the Sudan, and Turkish guards kept peace over Christian shrines in the Holy Land. Later, I spent many weeks traveling from Cape Town to Durban to Johannesburg to Beira to Rhodesia and back through the Suez. During those two score years, the map from the Cape to Cairo, from Joppa to Bombay was getting redder and redder. There can be no doubt that Britain's soldiers, marines, airmen have much to do with the map changes. I heard General Allenby relate how he entered Jerusalem. In the escort, back of him, were riflemen from Australasia and 40,000 camels. They "struck hard." I read lately that Britain was centralizing her forces around the Mediterranean, at Cyprus. It is easy to imagine Britain's planes going from there to India and to Cape Town, and if necessary covering all the regions roundabout. It presents a sombre aspect!

I confess when I recall Bowring, writer of two most exquisite Christian hymns, "Watchman, Tell Us of the Night," "God Is Love," and that he was one of the war makers in the Chinese Opium War, a century ago, that really marked the beginning of "all our woes" in China—and recall Balfour (whose books I as a young theologian read with approval) and there rises with him the names of Ireland and Palestine—I confess that I tremble as Britain's war record unrolls before me. Britain is mine in the same way that Shakespeare and Burns, are mine. Thirty years ago I escorted over a hundred American boys (on bicycles) to the

shrines, and all round Great Britain. "The Lady of the Lake" was read on the Silver Strand on our wedding trip. So, Britain is mine. I have helped to maintain her fine highways, her old-fashioned candle-lighted inns and church services and East-End Settlements. I even helped to keep going that celebrated British institution, Thos. Cook and Sons, by buying tickets for a tour round Palestine!

I confess I tremble when I recall Britain's war record and see what is going on today. She has many "special interests" in the Far East, the Near East, and from North to South Poles, that seem to need buttressing by arms! The same morning I read of bombing in Shanghai I also read of bombing in Northwest India! So it goes. Britain has had a habit (as other nations) of encircling her competitors. When a nation is armed, and as powerfully as Britain, this process is sinister in contemplation. It would be quite easy and natural to be friendly to Italy with France in her eye; to be friendly with France with Germany in her eye; to be friendly with France and Poland with Russia in her eye; to be friendly with Japan with India and America in her eye. Such is the political game, and it is not difficult to think of Britain encircling America, as a competitor. So it goes. There is *no way* to take the poison out of nations in competition, and remove the danger of war, except the way of complete general disarmament.

My third reason why Britain ought to *lead off in* a plan for Total Disarmament comes as a warning. If Britain, in this the supreme day of opportunity, fails, it will be to court disaster for herself and mankind. A war, with mankind armed as now, will certainly spell extinction for much of our best civilization, with its attendant horrors. If America had the position and will to lead in this, how happy I should be! Manifest destiny clearly points to Britain as foreordained to do this. America could play a good second. I believe that she would, if Britain were to lead out. Let Mr. Macdonald telephone Mr. Hoover on reading this, and make the dare? Some leader some day is going to do this. It is now Britain's chance! It would be worth while for King George to break precedent and call up President Hoover. If Herbert Hoover were to help to bring this to pass, he wouldn't need to spend any money for election expenses. Britain has produced many great leaders. Is there not one now great enough to throw open the gates for a new day, by turning the lever of total disarmament?

Britain, I covet your power for America! A supreme honor hangs over your head. Now is the time! If you do not lead, the sceptre will be taken from your hand! Meantime, mankind will walk in great darkness and bitterness. If you fail not in this the hour of man's great need and lead the world out into total disarmament—then will be indeed peace and good will!

Britain, do you want peace? There can be no peace without disarmament. How can there be peace when every Great Power in Europe is armed for war? It is easier to get disarmament than to handle world economics. Disarmament is the sole protection against war.

Given total disarmament, capitalists and communists can fight it out in the forums and legislative halls. Without total disarmament—which Britain could give if she would—people are advised to "begin digging and provisioning a shelter a couple of hundred feet under ground in anticipation of the deluge."

SYDNEY STRONG.

Geneva, Switzerland.

Security and Armaments

(2) *Security Through Disarmament**

If all the armaments in the world were sent to the bottom of the sea, what would happen?

Everybody, with the possible exception of a few stupid old generals, a handful of old-fashioned diplomats and War Office officials, and perhaps a scattering of rich old dames, would rejoice, and exclaim: "What a relief! and what fools we have been all these years to encumber ourselves with such a burden, and to enslave our minds with the fear that burden has stimulated!"

What else would happen? Simply this, that being without arms and the means of war, Governments would turn their attention to improving the peace machinery for the settlement of international disputes which in this imperfect world are bound to arise from time to time.

Thanks to the League of Nations such machinery largely exists already. In addition to the Hague Court, there exists what is known as the General Act of Arbitration, which has been accepted by a large number of nations. This instrument outlines the machinery and lays down the procedure for the settlement of every kind of dispute which can arise between nations. Neither the machinery nor the procedure is perfect or pretends to be, but it is there, and can be improved as experience demands.

Sooner or later, of course, the question would arise as to what to do with recalcitrant nations, those which persisted in acting unjustly towards their neighbors, or which refused to honor their debts and other obligations, or perhaps the findings of the courts, tribunals, etc., whose decisions must be accepted if international intercourse is to be maintained.

The answer is simple. Armaments being out of the way it would be necessary to devise a technique for dealing with nations which refused to conform with generally accepted procedure, and insisted on being a law unto themselves. Reason cannot be so bankrupt as to be incapable of finding an alternative to the policy of blowing out people's brains.

The rudiments of such a technique are contained in the Covenant of the League of Nations, and indeed there was recently considerable agitation for their adoption against Japan on the occasion of her invasion of Manchuria. The sort of measures contemplated include the withdrawal of ambassadors from the offending country, the stoppage of loans, and possibly the refusal to buy certain of its merchandise, etc.

It will readily be appreciated that any action of this kind, taken by all the nations acting in consort would have an immediate effect upon a rebellious na-

*This is the second of two articles by the Political Agent of the War Resisters' International, England. The first article was published in the last issue of UNITY—Editor.

tion. Even a simple act like the withdrawal of ambassadors, would have astonishing repercussions, financial and economic, as well as moral, and thus would have a salutary effect upon any nation which was determined to play the part of bully.

Along these lines justice would ultimately be worked out. It is not contended that everything would be straightforward, and that mistakes would not be made, but by and by a new technique would be evolved which would give general satisfaction, and which, with all its faults and limitations would be a thousand times better than the way of war. Under a war system the scales are weighted in favor of the bully, the possessor of powerful arms, rich industrial countries being in a much stronger position from every point of view than poor, agricultural countries, and although it is not pretended that the wealthy nations would not continue to get some advantage for some time to come, it is indisputable that justice would hold wider sway under a peace system than under a war system.

Very soon the nations would realize the advantage of conference and arbitration, and would accustom themselves to placing their case in the important disputes, before the tribunal of world public opinion, being convinced that by such means they would be able to secure a greater measure of justice than by any other, certainly than by the arbitrament of war.

But ought we not to go further?

So far I have argued the case for security on the assumption that all the nations disarmed together. I am as strongly convinced, however, that total disarmament would be the line of maximum security even if undertaken by one nation alone.

I have already described the enormous risks of armaments, shown that powerful armaments stimulate fear, precipitate conflicts, and entail virtual extermination should war ensue.

Obviously no risk could be greater than that.

What most critics of the policy of disarmament by example overlook is that it is a positive and not a negative policy. A nation—and especially were it one of the Big Powers—which disarmed alone, could only take that step after considerable propaganda and discussion, and as the result of heroic leadership. In other words it could only take it as the result of a process of moral elevation.

Now it is an acknowledged fact that moral force is the most powerful force in the world. Hence the nation which did what all the nations openly confess they want to see done but have not the courage to do separately, would be hailed by all as the greatest nation in the world. The moral standing which its action would thus give to it would constitute the greatest possible security. No army could possibly be induced to march against it. It would, indeed, be regarded universally as the deliverer of mankind from its greatest enemy.

The evidence that the peoples of the world regard war as the greatest enemy of civilization, which must be destroyed at all costs, and therefore they want to be rid of armaments is overwhelming. The world-wide expressions of mass opinion on the question in connection with the World Disarmament Conference are a convincing proof of this. That being so, it unquestionably follows that the nation which had the courage to disarm of itself would receive the acclamations and even the reverence of humanity entire, and would undoubtedly be the safest nation in the world.

Just as the people of Britain and France refused to allow their Governments to organize an attack upon Russia in 1920, so the peoples of the whole world would refuse to allow the nation which disarmed alone, to be attacked.

A further reason for this immunity from attack would be that the act of disarming would signify that the nation which disarmed was prepared to put its trust in reason, in humanity itself, in its sense of fair play. How would it be possible, therefore, to attack such a nation? But supposing the impossible did happen, what then?

Obviously the attack could not succeed. In the first place world public opinion would resound with growing momentum against the attacking nation. In the second place the League of Nations would be brought into action, and as the question of the aggressor could not be in doubt, common action by its members, on the lines already mentioned, would if need be speedily be taken. It might of course be that the unarmed nation would in such circumstances suffer some injury, but in doing so it would have won the biggest battle recorded in history, the battle which finally overthrew war and thus saved civilization. Such injury, moreover, would be wholly insignificant in comparison with the devastations of war.

Finally, it might be argued that in no case would an imperialist power disarm unless it were prepared to abandon all rights of conquest, and to place its relations with its "Empire" on a basis of friendly co-operation. It should not be forgotten that our conceptions of Empire are changing as rapidly as our conceptions of war, so that a nation which acted in an enlightened way in regard to disarmament would also be willing to act with equal enlightenment towards its "Empire." In that case there would be no need to fear attacks, as the forces above described would be brought into operation on behalf of the people attacked, if they desired it, which would depend upon the extent to which their aspirations for self-expression and self-development were being satisfied.

Then it should be borne in mind that, as in India, unarmed peoples are developing a technique of non-violent resistance which of course would be used against any unwanted invader. As Gandhi has often pointed out to the British Government in regard to the defense of the North Western Provinces of India, Britain need not worry about that as India will know how to deal with invasions if and when they occur. Nor can it be denied that Gandhi and his followers have already gained greater victories for their cause by the method of non-violence than they could possibly have done by violence.

From whatever point of view we look, therefore, total disarmament, even unilateral disarmament, is the line of maximum security.

There can be no security whatever under the war system as that has now become, nor can there be any trustworthy partial disarmament. So powerful have the instruments of war become that the risks of armaments are infinitely greater than the risks of disarmament.

From which it follows that every sincere worker for peace should demand total disarmament—for the whole world, if possible, but in any case for his own nation, irrespective of what other nations may do.

Enfield, England. WILFRED WELLOCK.

The Significance of the Lindbergh Case

In view of the astounding developments in the tragedy which has occurred in the home of America's beloved flyer, we are forced to take more than a sentimental interest in the case. It is not unlikely that this will become the great American Tragedy, and may do more to evolve a new social order than all of the widespread misery of our generation. Out of this may grow a new American temper which will not only produce champions and shower them with ticker tape, but discover new achievements which will henceforth receive our acclaim.

Theodore Dreiser pointed to the young man who went to the electric chair for the murder of a former sweetheart as the tragic American. Yet there is infinitely more tragedy in the utter despair of this other young American, also a victim of his environment, yet who played the game according to the rules. The Lindbergh tragedy is the tragedy of America. If we correctly interpret its significance, we see in it a powerful parable of our times. Just as the child suddenly disappeared without warning and caused endless speculation as to its possible return, so that great American talisman, prosperity, disappeared. Will it come back or will it be found dead?

Three great problems of this generation are the problems of wealth, of crime, and of the crowd, and the inter-relation between them. Each of these is not only an integral part of our economic dislocation, but also of the Lindbergh case.

There have always been crimes committed for riches, because of riches, and in the name of riches. It is also true that misdemeanors of this nature increase during a time of widespread want. The president of one of our great railroads, no doubt recalling Jean Valjean, remarked that a man had a right to steal rather than starve. But we would not seek to justify dishonesty, even in times like these, least of all kidnapping, or the defrauding of a wealthy society woman by a former department of justice man, or the effort of a bankrupt shipbuilder to recoup his fortune. It is, however, possible for us to understand crimes of this nature in a civilization which has put such a high premium upon wealth, even to the extent of assigning to the wealthy, infallibility in matters of political judgment and philosophic inquiry as well as business acumen. It is well known that wealth did not undermine the simplicity of the youth who flew the Atlantic, nor was it the determining factor in the life of the man whose daughter he married, but it is also self-evident that these were exceptional cases. Unless large concentrations of wealth in private hands are made into social reservoirs, it will be rifled by those lawless elements less deserving of its benefits.

Not only does wealth stand out as one of the elements of the Lindbergh case, but also the professional criminal. To blame Prohibition for this atrocity committed against a sleeping child is merely to say that the citizen who has insisted on getting his liquor has added to the ranks of the protected lawbreaker. There were kidnappings before the Eighteenth Amendment was enacted, but hardly so many. In the last two years, four hundred cities in the United States reported cases of this kind, and two thousand persons paid ransoms for release from abductors. It appears certain that opposing gangs of bootleggers and hijackers occasionally seek rest from the machine guns of their wily adversaries and turn to the less hazardous occupation of crib-robbing. Respectable society must either stop drinking or must provide two-gun men nurses for its children. Whereas the exposure of the Norfolk gentlemen was the greatest farce of this case, the naming of two New York racketeers as go-betweens was the greatest tragedy. This gave the famous Capone courage to barter publicly for his own freedom. But let no one think that crime is only of the underworld! A former Secretary of the Interior was in the penitentiary on that fatal night, along with numbers of respected business men and high government officials. Let polite society as it now engages in its gigantic manhunt pause for a moment and say, "Lord, be merciful to me, a sinner."

Along with the crime problem goes the matter of law enforcement. No doubt the Cochran Bill to make kidnapping a federal crime punishable by death will carry in Congress, along with other restrictive legislation, but we have learned by now that mere legislation cures nothing. The man who steals children is not thinking of what some legislature has done, but only of what the police will do. If he is likely to be caught, *sans* finger prints, *sans* trail of any kind, he will think twice. Otherwise, he will go to some center of population and await developments.

The other great problem in this tragedy is that of the crowd. A young man idolized by crowds everywhere—Europe, America, Central America, and lastly Asia—at last discovers that fame is his chief liability. Crowds kill with their kindness. Former Ambassador Herrick relates that only a happy accident saved the life of Charles Lindbergh from being crushed out by an enthusiastic throng at Le Bourget field. In London, souvenirs were torn from his plane, and in his own land his boyish smile was finally erased as he time and again passed between the thick ranks of the curious. The editor of *Editor and Publisher* apologized for the behavior of newspaper reporters on the evening of his wedding, and finally in the early days of his great sorrow, he made pathetic appeals to the public to "let the kidnappers get through." No doubt he wonders, as he contemplates these Americans with their morbid curiosity as they crowd about the undertaking establishment, as they erect sandwich stands near the lonely spot where his child lay, as they run telephone lines almost over the improvised grave, he wonders at their tirelessness, but more at their inability to help him in his hour of need. The problem of the crowd is the problem of the big city. When men today speak of decentralizing our urban centers they are not only thinking of song birds and garden plots, but of recovering that vital aspect of living—neighborliness. The words "good morning," so simple in themselves, are weighted with significance for civilization. In the direction of anonymity lies defeat and ever more suitcases being tossed over a cemetery wall within a few minutes' time from Times Square.

Not only do we have the great problems today of wealth, crime and the crowd, but we have the fundamental problems of individualism and the machine. Lindbergh illustrates almost to the point of fiction the typical American who begins with nothing—a five hundred-dollar government plane—and through the

strength of courage and the beneficent god of luck, rises to the top of his profession in an incredibly short time. But, and here the story breaks down, he did not live happy ever after. We are at the turning-point in this old, traditional, Pollyanna Americanism. From now on "we" will not represent the man plus his machine, but rather the man plus other men. It is not enough to put one's trust in machinery alone, however long it is to drone. One must also get weather reports. We have been thinking of our Wright whirlwind motors in society to the exclusion of weather phenomena. No longer does the weather-vane point toward individualism, but rather toward collectivism. Hints of this are seen in Lindbergh's biography, "We." He points out that the government should have encouraged commercial aviation. He had to leave a state university and go to a commercial flying field, and finally enlist in the army air service, before he could become proficient in his field. He tells of his barnstorming, his circus stunting, and his private taxi service which are perfect illustrations of the old individualism. That the world is ready to forsake the old individualism among nations is shown by the reception he received in the many foreign lands he visited. He became "an ambassador without portfolio."

To illustrate this contrast between the old individualism and the new collectivism, we need think of another young American, and particularly the treatment which society accorded to him in contrast with Lindbergh. His name was Joe York and he too practiced a rigid body discipline so that he could get along with little food and sleep. He was not thinking of a trans-Atlantic flight, but the perilous journey of civilization itself. He was a Communist and a leader of a hunger march, and society approved the shooting of him. On the other hand, society gave to the other, every conceivable reward—honorary degrees, medals, wealth, and station. Indeed it gave him everything except security for his child.

The parable needs no interpretation. Society has been wrong—it has thrown its confetti on the wrong person. Still worse, it has been so busy shouting hozannas that it has allowed itself to be crucified by those lawless elements in society, not only below ground but on the steps of the White House itself. If the nation can see this, then the name of Lindbergh will become a symbol—his tragedy will lead to a new civilization. Then will he not have flown an ocean, nor his little son's life been taken, in vain.

HAROLD P. MARLEY.

"Men of Labor, Lift the Cry"*

A Plea for Peace

Weary mothers, what the gain
To bring forth your sons in vain,
Then behold them torn by shell
On the battle-fields of hell?
Mothers, wherefore give your sons
To the hunger of the guns—
To the trenches deep in mud,
Loud with curse and red with blood?
All for what?—that rulers may
Have their glory for a day.

Men of labor, wherefore spill
Blood upon the battle-hill?
Does it matter who shall win—
Who shall slay and enter in?
Who shall rule you as a king,
This is but an empty thing.
If the enemy win at last
When the awful dice is cast,
Will you have a worser bread,
Will you have a harder bed?
Whether you win or lose the spoil,
You will still be slaves of toil,
You will still have loss and lack,
Have old burdens on your back.
For whichever nation rules
You will still be only tools
Tools for masters (nothing new!)
Building fortunes for the Few.

Wake, O peoples, to the wrong
And repel it with a song—
All this death of love and life,
This delirium of strife.
In high moments, lightly gay,
Let us fling these wars away.
Let us meet as fraters—trust
In the wisdom of the just.
There is honor still in men:
Let us learn to love again.
Lift, O peoples, lift the cry,
Till it shakes the pillared sky!

EDWIN MARKHAM

*Written by Edwin Markham for the New History Society, New York City, and sung as "Peace Anthem" at their Green Shirt Ball Saturday, April 9th.

"Love Spake Within My Heart"

Love spake within my heart
That in my heart might grow
The strong, importunate desire
That all men should know. . . .
Where men worshipped Mammon
I cried above the crowd:
What Love spake in silence
I might not speak aloud.

Truth is idle getting,
Beauty, bitter loss:
But Love is a Carpenter
Who made himself a Cross. . . .
Earth is too little
And Heaven too vast—
Where shall my spirit
Find him at last?

REGINALD A. REYNOLDS.

The Survey

There have been hours when I have asked, with grief,
What have I wrought through all my mortal years?
Now am I done with vain regrets and tears,
And all my measurings of fruit and sheaf.
Between this autumn, and my springtime leaf
I have adventured far beyond my fears,
And if my hopes still find me in arrears
My hopes survive, and baffle every thief.

Yet more I count than all of this concern
With aught that I have either lost or won
This, that the total human task I deem
Surpassing so the individual dream
I am content to have out-viewed the sun
And what the sun shall yet behold, discern.

ROBERT WHITAKER

Bread Line

What means these silent men in line
Their look of hunger keen?
I watch who have both bread and wine
And know that life is lean.

They tremble as they forward go
To snatch a bitter crust,
A thousand men all in a row
Begrimed with dirt and lust.

GEORGIANA BOLE KING.

The Study Table

The Story of War versus Civilization

A German army-officer with brains and a heart—in fact, he had been a heart specialist—who ventured to use both while Europe was a slaughter-house plunged in a nightmare of universal conflict, essayed to write "The Biology of War." Dr. G. F. Nicolai landed in a military prison for his pains, from which, some months later, both the author and his book contrived to escape to Denmark, later to Switzerland, (one of the few triumphs of aviation in the service of constructive intelligence during the World War!) where the book found a publisher and a considerable audience. The volume predicted, on the basis of scientific analogy, the extinction of war, and contended not only that war should be regarded as something morbid and eradicable, like small-pox or the Bubonic plague, but that there is no biological justification for it, and none for the argument,—so dear to army-officers, Treitschkists and old-maids,—that without it nations must become effeminate and degenerate. It was among the few truly important books published during the War; it is, however, never referred to in university courses in either biology or politics,—these two "branches" being totally disconnected in the curriculum, (although intimately related in life); or being considered together sometimes, in order to apply the supposed validity of the Darwinian dogma to human society, as demonstrated by "the survival of the fittest" among the nations in the late unpleasantness between them. The falsity of that analogy Dr. Nicolai's work had plainly demonstrated.

In England, even, at the same time, Mr. Bertrand Russell was engaged in writing a brilliant psycho-analysis of the phenomenon of war as an attribute of the State and of the religion of patriotism,—a religion generated, as he said, chiefly by tribal feeling and sustained by numerous supposed benefits, litanies and lies leading inevitably to periodic international holocausts. "It is of the essence of the State," he declared, "to suppress violence within, and to facilitate it without. It makes an entirely artificial division of mankind and of our duties towards them." And Bertrand Russell went to jail in England for this and other indiscreet but substantially veracious utterances. If he had written nothing more after producing "Why Men Fight," his intelligence and fame would be amply justified. . . . So much for the truth in his time.

Now comes another and a younger Englishman from a military family (his father a Brigadier-General, his brother a Major, himself a Captain in the British Army during the World War) with a volume* which, in a sense combines the work of Nicolai and Russell, and corroborates both, with a wealth of historic citation and psychological exposure. "They That Take the Sword" is a veritable encyclopaedia of culture-history; it constitutes the most reasoned and damning indictment of war, of the prevailing international anarchy, of the mind of the soldier and the incompetence of even the highest military professionals and most famous of conquering heroes, from Hannibal to Foch, ever, we venture to think, published in our language.

This is not merely a work of amazing historical erudition and sociological recapitulation; it is an acute analysis of the human mind and the imaginative fictions by which it lives and dies, a history of military tactics and blunders, an explanation of militarism in Assyria, Egypt, Greece, Rome, Prussia and Japan, a solemn warning of the suicide confronting modern civilization menaced by the revolutionary mechanisms of war which it has invented and can no longer control—and, finally, an exhortation written in the spirit of the gospel of St. Paul and Paul's faith in the redemptive power of universal love and of a regenerated human nature once awakened to the issues that confront it, inspired and informed. The chapter entitled "Conflict and Love," which ought, perhaps, to be the last rather than the second in the book, is reminiscent of Plato's *Symposium,* and it contains a gospel of salvation ripe for the bewildered seekers of an unhappy and cruel Machine Age, a gospel which is a synthesis of science and creative love. Here is the glowing gist of it:

> Whether we limit our survey to the microcosmus of one individual or widen it to include the whole of human evolution, we see that every tragedy of civilization is one of arrested, or perverted, or insufficient love. . . . Love is no simple emotion whose value is measured merely by its intensity. It is a less recent comer into the world than reason, and it is only by applying reason to love that love is prevented from being, like its parent, imagination, a merely neutral source of increased power, that may be applied for any purpose, creative or suicidal. . . . More crimes have probably been committed in the name of love than that of liberty. . . . Like the mystics of Christian Europe, and of the Near and Far East, we look for the coming of the kingdom, a kingdom within us, and binding us ultimately together in one all-embracing unity, the effect of which will be not to annihilate, but to fulfill and perfect every lesser love. We look for the human race becoming consciously alive and taking charge of its own destinies, until every particle of matter and every quantum of energy at its command is employed in wise and harmonious unison, and all waste and conflict is eliminated; until, in Dante's culminative and magnificent words, desire and will are rolled, as a wheel that moveth equally, by the love that moveth the sun and the other stars. (Page 28.)

In exposition of the thesis that "The process of Civilization is, in fact, one of perpetually widening peace" (p. 68), the author is at pains to correct the hackneyed "Cave Man Fallacy." The phenomenon of war from its alleged origins in the nature of primitive man and his developing social institutions and wasting conflicts is traced from the pre-historic Magdalenian culture of the deep-browed Cromagnon nimrod and his adversary, the saber-toothed tiger, to that of M. Clemenceau, who, by a curious omission, is not mentioned in a volume of over four hundred compact and lucidly-written pages. Wingfield-Stratford's conception of primeval human nature is measurably more favorable than that, for instance, of Bertrand Russell concerning contemporary humankind. Whereas, the latter, writing during the War, declared:

> The ultimate fact from which war results is the fact that a large proportion of mankind have an impulse to conflict rather than harmony, and can only be brought to cooperate with others in resisting or attacking a common enemy. Most men, when they feel themselves sufficiently strong, set to work to make themselves feared rather than loved. . . . The impulse to quarreling and self-assertion, the pleasure of getting one's own way in spite of opposition, is native to most men. It is this, rather than any motive of calculated self-interest, which produces war and causes the difficulty of bringing about a World-State.

The author of "They That Take the Sword" finds

*"They That Take the Sword," by Esmé Wingfield-Stratford. Published by William Morrow & Co., New York.

almost the contrary to be the case in considering ancient man and primitive peoples:

However far we go back in time, however low we descend in the scale of civilization, we shall look in vain for the faintest evidence that a state of war is the normal relation between individual members of the human species (Thomas Hobbes to the contrary notwithstanding). It is not only right but natural for Man to love his neighbor, if not as himself, at least more than he hates him. (Page 39.)

Again:

Certainly no animal was ever less fitted by nature for a combative rôle than man. His arboreal ancestor may be presumed to have been a fairly harmless and probably sociable fellow. His immediate relations, the apes, are by no means pugnacious. The orang-outang is so far from being an object of terror, that he is believed by the local natives to be a man like themselves who lives wild and keeps his mouth shut for the excellent purpose of dodging the tax-collector. As for the chimpanzee—(see page 33)!

Presumably, no respectable gorilla would ever dream of kidnaping the baby of a prominent member of the tribe, howsoever pretty the baby. Some Americans, however, not only dream but do that kind of thing; and something like war quite unnaturally,—or naturally,— results. Which renders the verdicts of both philosophers just, and makes the brave idea of Moral Progress look very sick, indeed!

It is true that Russell immediately added to the foregoing piece of pessimism concerning human nature, the observation that, though the impulse to self-assertion is strong, there is no reason why it should be allowed to lead to war; it was exactly the same impulse which led to duelling, yet men—civilized men—"conduct their private quarrels now without bloodshed." Do they? . . . Perhaps they do in England, but this reviewer has the misfortune to live in Chicago—which renders the reading of great books like these at once a little bizarre, and a civic duty—of the first order. It is true that the duel as an institution is dead, and that the acute sense of self-love, or honor, which justified it under the Bourbons has been transferred to the nation, whose most lawless behavior is justified today by the perplexing and contradictory sentiment of patriotism. (*Vide* Japan). It is encouraging to believe, with Russell, that

If political contest within a World-State were substituted for war, imagination would soon accustom itself to the new situation, as it has accustomed itself to the absence of dueling. Through the influence of institutions and habits, without any fundamental change in human nature, men would learn to look back upon war as we look upon the burning of heretics, or upon human sacrifice to heathen deities.

It is highly interesting to learn from Wingfield-Stratford that the duel is not a primitive survival but a modern innovation by which four thousand French noblemen exterminated themselves in the brief reign of Henry IV., and which Cardinal Richelieu and Louis XIV, by great firmness, and even execution, succeeded in suppressing for a time. Of its origin, he says:

The assumption that might is right, in the eyes of the gods, was the foundation of the judicial duel, or trial by combat, that was so widespread an institution among the barbarian tribes who burst the barriers of Rome, though the greatest of all their leaders, Theodoric, was civilized enough to suppress single combat among his own Ostrogoths. . . . Among the fierce and cruel Aztecs, it was a capital offence so much as to offer a (personal) challenge.

As a modern institution the duel was the ancient ordeal of battle with the religious element taken out.

But it is even more significant to learn that the decline of the duel accompanied the triumph of the middle-classes in England. The black-coated city-worker with his usually Puritan upbringing, which tended to regard duels as sinful, his commonsense which revolted from a thing so stupid, and his sense of humor, soon exterminated the institution and the peculiar notions of aristocratic honor which sustained it. In France, likewise, it was the Revolution, and the political and social emancipation of the Third Estate which gave the duel its coup-de-grace. . . . What is the conclusion from all this if not to suggest that nothing less than the triumph of the Fourth Estate, and something like the proletarianization of morals and the socialization of property,—nothing less—will undermine the institution of nationalism and of war today?

Neither Russell with all his insight, nor Wingfield-Stratford with all his learning, has committed himself to acceptance of any conclusion so drastic and unorthodox, but logical, as this. The latter dreads and deplores both Communism and Fascism as constituting a Machiavellian and deadly menace to Western Civilization. "Like Fascism," he says, "Bolshevism is a creed of collective egotism enforced by unlimited violence," though, perhaps, "grander in complexion than the self-inflated provincialism that esteems one Italian better than a thousand foreigners." "Italy has bartered her birthright of the muses for a mess of hell-broth. . . ." Though world-wide in conception, the gospel of Marx preaches a class-war "which by its very nature is more ruthless than any national war could be, and, like all war, suicidal; for if civilization is divided against itself, it cannot stand." (p. 367.)

Russell, indeed, recognized as the present writer does not appear to do, the intimate relation of private property and its inequitable distribution to war. This is, perhaps, because Russell has traveled more widely in the contemporary world and has observed its competitive financial feudalisms at their mischievous and cruel work. Wingfield-Stratford, indeed, takes little cognizance in general of economic forces as a significant interpretation of history, being steeped in the moral, political, religious and military factors and forces of the complex interplay of states and empires that make up the terrible epic of human wars, of which the worst still overclouds the life of men and nations today. Although, in his brief discussion of the American Revolution, he is narrowly economic in his view, and strangely obtuse to the import of its moral issues and consequences, even to Europe and to England, he is throughout his *magnum opus* concerned, and perhaps rightly so—granted his high purpose—rather with the hope of unity than with the history of liberty that has led men to anarchy and may lead mankind to perdition. His judgment, therefore, of the Holy Alliance, and of English foreign policy with relation to it is, perhaps, unique among English historians, and strikingly interesting:

The Holy Alliance did at least offer a cure for the most deadly evil of all—international anarchy. Only let the principle of unity be maintained and that of liberty might, in course of time, have been added thereto. But to fall back upon anarchy—as was Canning's only idea—was a counsel of despair, if not of ultimate suicide. . . . "Each nation for itself and God (or anarchy) for us all!" was his declared policy; it was largely owing to England's position, as well as to the clash of Russian and Austrian policy in the Balkans, that the attempt to perpetuate the peace of Europe by a League of Sovereigns finally broke down. We cannot but regret it. (Page 284.)

The spiritual solution of the international problem having been ruled out, in 1830, as it was in the 17th century, by the total collapse of the exalted dream of the unity of Christendom, "collective egotism

backed by violence held the field," culminating inevitably in the World War.

That prolonged act of criminal lunacy, in which the military mind was revealed as more stupid and unteachable than at any time in the past, not only stripped the last rags of romance and decency from the business of international butchery, but made it clear as day that civilized man has received his last warning. Either he must put his new house in order and adapt himself to the environment of a machine age, or perish soon and miserably.

"They That Take the Sword" is a volume less of prophecy than of history, of world history as men have made it, and alas! as they might have made it under the reign of august Athene rather than the men of might and Mars. Its appearance at an hour so critical in European history is a gratifying sign that thought is not yet paralyzed by the fear of doom, Spengler notwithstanding. Its style leaves nothing to be desired, save an indication of the authorship of numberless happy quotations with which its brilliant pages are studded. One misses any adequate analysis of the injury done the body of European civilization by the Treaty of Versailles and the other post-war settlements; and notes the singular absence of any realistic discussion of the League of Nations and its constitutional defects revealed by twelve years' operation of that very noble experiment. There is no appeal even for the completion of the League by the entrance of Russia and the United States, to say nothing of the conscious establishment of a World-State and a universal federation of self-governing nations. Were the author less of a historian and more of a political scientist concerned with the invention of functioning organs of international government, the volume would be of much greater value, the facts of the past and of the present crisis being what they are. Of these he is more fully aware than most historians, and of the future's desperate gamble.

The important omissions of constructive suggestion for solution of the interwoven economic, financial and political crisis are compensated, to some degree, by the author's glowing faith that civilization will not be destroyed—which all his facts would seem to contradict. Though another major war can end only in military stalemate and universal ruin and exhaustion, the ex-captain believes that another war will not be allowed to come. To read his volume to the end is a liberal education of the heart no less than the head. Though he cannot save us, he can warn, and he writes in the faith that if God is a spirit, Man is no less.

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

Correspondence

Military Expenditures

Editor of UNITY:

How many persons have a clear idea of what an enormous amount $1,000,000,000 really is? A simple arithmetical calculation will serve to illustrate.

Suppose a pile of a billion silver dollars were desired. Suppose the pile had been begun with the year 1, A. D., and a dollar had been added to it every minute day and night for 1900 years, the amount would not quite reach the desired billion. A billion is a practically inconceivable amount.

A recent estimate sets the cost of the World War at $30,000,000 a day. The war lasted for somewhat more than four years. At that rate for four and a quarter years the war cost more than 45 billions. But that estimate is altogether too conservative. A reliable estimate of about $300,000,000,000 has been made, an amount positively beyond the grasp of the human mind. And the most of that was expended for instruments of destruction and death or was exploded in shot and shell. Think of that vast amount literally wasted in a procedure which Prof. H. A. Overstreet calls "stupidly insane" and which no person in his right mind dares to defend today!

Considering all that wanton waste of money and time that might—and should—have been utilized for constructive and progressive purposes—not for massacring the youthful hope of the world—should any thoughtful person be surprised at the terrible mess nations are in today with world-wide depression and financial entanglements? What is an honest answer to the question, "Who won the World War?"

For there is just one major cause for the world's unprecedented predicament and that cause is the lunacy of warfare and the gigantic cost of armaments! And yet all the Great Powers, with the exception of Germany, are more heavily armed now than before 1914. Do they want to plunge the world into worse disasters than we now face? The corollary is unavoidable that only in total disarmament is security from warfare possible since nations will not refrain from using armaments so long as they possess them.

And yet the delegates of the Great Powers are not striving with might and main to cooperate in abolishing at once and forever the armaments of all nations which even now threaten our future peace! They are discussing technicalities and ratios and not agreeing even on those! And, notwithstanding the extreme needs of millions of our people, our Congressional naval committee is demanding an appropriation of nearly a billion for vessels that will never be used unless Congress should violate its own legislation.

The abominable and literal throwing away of taxpayers' hard-earned money by the military department was well exemplified by the program of air maneuvers carried out in a chain of cities from the Pacific to the Atlantic only about a year ago even though there were then millions of able and upright workers out of employment and distress was increasing in every section of the land. Boston was visited in spite of protests from prominent citizens.

These demonstrations cost many millions. I don't know the exact cost of the Boston show but figures from an authentic source in Dayton, Ohio, were that the cost of their exhibition was $3,000,000. It required 13,000 gallons of gasoline per hour to keep the armada of 670 planes in the sky. Presuming the cost was equal at every city, what was the huge total? And the previous winter a paltry $25,000 for aid to relieve suffering and starvation in Arkansas brought about through natural causes had been denied by Congress. And to what purpose was the demonstration staged anyway?

There is one clear, plain and logical way out of the quicksand into which the world is surely sinking and that way is total and immediate disarmament. It is a logical sequence to the Kellogg pact. Do the nations intend to honor that or not? Do we as a nation favor it or repudiate it? Chief Justice Hughes referred to it as a pledge and said: "Now that it has been given the honor of the country requires the faithful performance of it"; and also in the same speech: "Nations that proclaim their desire for peace must of necessity prove their sincerity by providing judicial institutions for the disposition of controversies."

If we truly desire peace and are to keep the pledge solemnly proclaimed by our government, why continue to squander huge sums of money on expensive armaments never to be used? Our people as a whole certainly want peace. Shall the peaceful majority be overruled by the war-minded minority? Why not take a firm stand for universal disarmament and our rich and powerful country lead the way? The silly and controversial points of aggressive or defensive vessels and technical matters would then be set at rest and no future war menace would hang over us. $5,000,000,000 annually is now being spent—literally wasted—on armaments and their upkeep. Can we imagine the benefit that would be derived if that were devoted to constructive purposes?

Let our watchword be "Immediate total and universal disarmament." If that were set in motion, how speedily the world would cheer up, business become normal and prosperity descend upon us.

LYDIA G. WENTWORTH.

Brookline, Massachusetts

Manifesto

Of the 7th Congress of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom

In these anxious days when the fate of the world is being decided, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom urges the Governments, before it is too late, to respond to the united appeal of the peoples for peace by abolishing arms and armies and by carrying out national and international reforms which will assure to them a future in which all nations will co-operate in harmony, and in which humanity may attain its full development.

The disastrous results of the last war through which States are being driven into agricultural, industrial, commercial and financial bankruptcy, are increasing every day. Although the world as a whole has abundant means to supply the needs of all the continents, millions of human beings are dying of hunger.

The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom believes that organized world co-operation must be the first step towards a new era and whatever dangers may menace mankind, in the future, none can be compared with the evils of war, which through the discoveries of science would be a war of extermination. If the world is to be saved from disaster, this co-operation must be organized without delay and must include the prevention of all possibility of war.

Following the example of its founders when in 1915, in war time, they met at The Hague to give warning to the world and to try to find ways of escaping disaster, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom assembled in Congress at Grenoble, May 1932, repeats this warning.

It is convinced that tremendous issues hang upon the success of the Disarmament Conference, and that its failure or prolonged delay would bring such an increase of fear and suspicion, such an addition to the miseries of the peoples already bowed down by the burden of armaments, as would lead inevitably to world war.

It follows, therefore, with deep anxiety the work of this Conference, from which the peoples expect immediate measures which will lead as rapidly as possible to total and universal disarmament. The methods of obstruction employed, the rejection or putting aside of propositions for disarmament and the composition of many of the delegations awake in the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom a justifiable indignation.

It rejects the suggestion that war can be humanized and declares that the only security lies in the abolition of war itself.

It declares that the solution of the problems of the organization of peace must be found in an international agreement for total and universal disarmament.

Consequently it insists that the Governments shall give to their Delegates at the Disarmament Conference orders to declare unequivocally from now onwards that total and universal disarmament is their goal and to fix the stages by which this shall be attained.

Convinced that reduction of armaments will lessen the danger of international conflicts, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom considers that this first Conference can and must respond to the people's demand and decide upon important reductions in all categories of armaments, sea, land, and air, upon an equal basis for all countries concerned, which must not imply rearmament of countries disarmed by the peace treaties.

Aware that profits made by certain groups and individuals are a main obstacle to disarmament, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom urges that immediate measures be taken to put an end to private manufacture and unrestricted trade in armaments.

It is strongly opposed to the creation of a new form of militarism in the shape of an international armed force in any form.

It demands the establishment of a Permanent Disarmament Commission with power to supervise the carrying out of agreements reached.

Grenoble, 15th-19th May, 1932.

Drinking in America

Editor of UNITY:

As a constant reader of UNITY, may I make a comment in reference to "Testimony for Prohibition," by Sydney Strong, in your issue of May 16th? He is one of your most interesting contributors. I read all he writes, especially his comments from Geneva, but he makes this statement in the article referred to:

> "Our friend, Judge Griffiths, of Seattle, told us that he had of late crossed the American continent twice and had not seen a single drunk man. We have had exactly the same experience. If we can travel 25,000 miles, and not have the landscape spoiled by sight of a drunkard, it is safe to say that America has traveled far, etc."

In traveling 25,000 miles, perhaps from a car window the landscape might not be spoiled by the sight of a drunkard, but did neither gentleman stop anywhere en route? Did neither of them stay in New York on their journeys? I have recently come from Pittsburgh, where I lived for more than twenty-five years, and know something of the conditions there. I have just returned from the mountain town of Altoona and was told something of its condition. I have lived a year now in New York, and not a month has passed (this is stating it very conservatively) that I have not had to change my seat in subway or elevated train because the man next me was so drunk as to endanger my clothing; I have hurried past a lurching form on the street, and gotten off a street car to avoid the maudlin drunkard.

But this is not so distressing as the drinking among the young. Being a non-drinker I have no reason to seek it, but friends of my young daughter who serve it in their homes, tell me they have no difficulty in getting it, and that not from places that hide under the name of speakeasy, nor camouflage under the title of tea-room or restaurant. No party, they tell me, is a success without it; and "success" means what, in my young days, would have been taboo at any party.

Without making any plea or argument for or against Prohibition, I merely ask for information. What is Prohibition, or where is it, at least in the city of New York?

MARY B. DAIN.

New York City.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 274)

Everyone will wish to promote this endeavor.

Now, in closing, one word to America and Britain—my ancestry for a 1,000 years—I want to tell you plainly, that if general total disarmament is not brought about within twelve months, the blame is upon you, combined. You have the power. God will hold you two responsible. Failure to act, and to act quickly, will bring upon you unimaginable disasters. Everyone in the press gallery knows it.

SYDNEY STRONG.

Geneva, Switzerland

A Provocative Statement Regarding Causes and Cures of the Depression

By
JEROME DAVIS, *Yale University*
and
BERTON EUGENE KILE, *Kile and Morgan Co., Providence*

No matter what one's economic beliefs may be, everyone is agreed that the world is facing one of the most serious economic crises in modern history. In an effort to stimulate thought as to the basic causes of this depression and the way out, we submit the following cryptic challenges:

A—What are the basic causes of the world depression?

1. As at present constituted, society is operated for the benefit of its successful organizers.

2. Power belongs, for the most part, to those who control wealth.

3. Production and distribution are not organized to serve society and supply the needs of mankind, but to increase the dividends and profits of the owners of wealth. Clothes are not made to clothe human beings, but for dividends. Restaurants are not run primarily to feed humanity, but to make profits for their owners. The result is periodic epochs of mad prosperity, followed by equally devastating periods of depression when millions are dependent on charity, or starve.

4. Credit has been manipulated not for the benefit of society but with

minimized or no capital investment for the benefit of those in control of credit. The increase of credit imposes an increased burden upon that portion of society engaged in creative work. This subtle burden has become unbearable.

5. Instead of keeping banks to their supreme function as safe depositories for the money of the people, they have been utilized to make vast fortunes for an inside few, thereby jeopardizing the security of the depositors. The result has been that since 1929, in the United States alone, over 4,000 banks have crashed, impoverishing the people.

6. Government has become infected with a profit psychosis, resulting in the inflation of governmental expenditure on a scale never before seen in the world. The result has been default on the part of many cities, states, and foreign countries, unbalanced budgets or taxation upon sources of income, creating an impossible burden upon society.

7. Governmental leaders, ever since the crash of 1929, have been engaged in trying to bolster up stock market values and safeguard party politics, instead of recognizing the fundamental causes of our difficulties, and devising permanent cures.

8. Instead of learning the lessons of the World War, to end all wars, we have permitted ourselves to enormously increase military expenditures far beyond anything the world had ever seen prior to the world conflict.

9. There is a gross mal-distribution of wealth, on account of a surplus in industry distributed to capital instead of divided with labor, so that intermittently large numbers of our people do not have sufficient purchasing power; we all suffer from the result of under-consumption, and millions are unemployed.

B—Some Suggested Ways Out

1. Instead of an aristocracy of property power, we must have an aristocracy of service and creative thought. This demands freedom of speech, freedom of the press and association, for all, even those whose ideas we oppose.

2. Human rights must forever be paramount to property rights.

3. We must recognize the necessity of a planned social and economic order for the benefit of all.

4. Profit in the operation of public utilities should be restricted to a fair income on actual capital invested, rates for service reduced to this basis, with published reports of income and expense of operating companies, and no return whatsoever on securities of holding companies.

5. Industrial income must be distributed through sharing current surplus from year to year with labor in proportion to the amount of service invested. Personal income and inheritance taxes should be greatly increased, and, if necessary, there should be a 100% tax on all personal incomes over $100,000.

6. Banks must again become institutions for safeguarding the deposits of the people, under Federal regulation, deposits insured, credit restricted, and made illegal on stock collateral securities, also illegal to foreign countries except under advice and restrictions of the State Department, with all information published and made publicly available.

7. Short selling of stocks and bonds should be made illegal, with heavy tax on transfers.

8. Living in congested areas with excess leisure time has created a moral anemia which would be greatly relieved by a general decentralizing movement of population and industry. The values of life have been too largely estimated from its pleasures. The soil furnishes sufficient and abundant food. Living in the open spaces brings return of responsibility to the individual, freeing him from paternalistic support.

9. Various civilizations have broken down on account of oppression—economic, political, or religious. The economic and political oppression in the United States has grown beyond the possibility of endurance. Shall it be corrected through intelligent, unselfish effort, or allowed to run its course, ending in revolution?

10. Interest must be created in the higher values of life, that mankind may not be subservient to political and industrial control, which has become bureaucratic, paternalistic and chrematistic.

The above does not necessarily represent the viewpoint of the Religion and Labor Foundation. It is printed solely to stimulate thought.

National Religion and Labor Foundation,
1807 Yale Station,
New Haven, Connecticut.

TO UNITY READERS

Greetings from a like minded person who has a delightful country place on the East shore of Lake Michigan which she would like to share with you.

One hundred or more people can be accommodated—an ideal spot for group conferences on social questions.

If interested write—

ERMINA MOORE

Syringa Bluff South Haven, Mich.

Development of the Peace Idea
And Other Essays

By Benjamin F. Trueblood,
Author of The Federation of the World
Collected and newly issued, with an introduction by Edwin D. Mead

This timely volume consists of twelve addresses and editorials, selected from the papers of the late peace leader, Benjamin F. Trueblood. They present the historical development of the peace idea from the earliest times to the period of the Hague Conferences and the outbreak of the World War. Among the essays are two valuable discussions of the contribution made by William Penn to the peace movement: "William Penn's Holy Experiment in Civil Government" and "William Penn and the Gospel of the Inner Light." Not the least important of the chapters is one entitled "The Case for the Limitation of Armaments."

243 pages; fully indexed. Privately printed. Crown 8vo $1.50, including postage.

The volume may be obtained from these bookstores:

Friends Book and Supply House, Richmond, Indiana.

Friends Bookstore, Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

Friends Book and Tract Committee, 144 East 20th Street, New York.

Just Out

A Charming Gift Book

THE HEART OF SCOTT'S POETRY

A Selection of the Best Poetry

of Sir Walter Scott

With a Critical Introduction,

By

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

This beautiful volume was prepared and published in recognition of the Scott Centenary (1832-1932)

Price $2.50

Order of your bookseller or of the publishers

Oxford University Press

114 Fifth Avenue New York City